

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION No.6836 of 2007

Dated:05.04.2007

-

Between:

Smt.Sunder Adivamma.

... Petitioner

AND

The Mandal Revenue Officer and another.

... Respondents

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION No.6836 of 2007

ORDER:

The petitioner allegedly succeeded to the property admeasuring Ac.1.12 guntas in Survey No.79 situated at Premavathipet Village of Rajendranagar Mandal in Ranga Reddy District. The land statedly was owned by her husband, whose name was recorded as a pattadar in the revenue records. In 2006 having come to know that the record of rights was changed incorporating the name of the second respondent as owner and possessor, the petitioner approached the Mandal Revenue Officer on 17.10.2006 requesting for correction and rectification of entries in the record of rights. By a memo bearing No.D/1774/2006, dated 31.01.2007, the first respondent rejected the application informing the petitioner that in the revenue records from 1976-1977 the name of the second respondent is recorded as pattadar in the necessary columns up to 2002-2003. Aggrieved by the same, the present Writ Petition is filed. The petitioner seeks a writ of mandamus declaring the impugned proceedings as illegal and arbitrary and for a consequential direction to the first respondent to rectify the entries showing the name of the petitioner as pattadar of land in Survey No.79 admeasuring Ac.1.12 guntas.

Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue (General-T). As rightly pointed out by the learned Assistant Government Pleader, the first respondent rejected the application for rectification/correction of entries on the ground that from 1976-1977 the name of the second respondent is recorded as pattadar. In such an event, this Court cannot issue another direction to the first respondent again to rectify the entries. If the petitioner is aggrieved, her

remedy is either to file an appeal before the Revenue Divisional Officer against the order of the first respondent or approach the civil Court and file a suit for declaration.

The Writ Petition is misconceived, and is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

(V.V.S.RAO, J)

05.04.2007

vs